

REMARKS

Claims 43-49 are all of the pending claims, with claim 43 being the sole independent claim. By virtue of this Amendment, Applicant cancels claim 50, without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicant submits this Amendment together with a Request for Continued Examination.

I. Examiner Interview:

Applicant thanks Examiner MacArthur for the courtesies extended during the in-person interview conducted on May 13, 2010. During the interview, Applicant resubmitted and elaborated upon the traversal arguments presented in the November 17, 2009 Amendment. The Examiner also pointed out structural features shown in Fig. 1 that could be incorporated into independent claim 43 to more clearly overcome the rejections of record, as indicated in the May 13, 2010 Interview Summary.

The above description, which is believed to satisfy the requirements of MPEP 713.04, is intended as an explanation only and is not intended to limit the invention defined by the claims of the present application.

II. Priority Document:

Applicant will submit a certified copy of the priority document at a later date.

III. Claim Rejections on Prior Art Grounds:

The Examiner rejects claims 43-50 under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over US 3,026,129 to L.B. Courtot et al. ("Courtot") in view of US 6,094,922 to Ziegler ("Ziegler"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

The pending claims are still believed to be patentable for all of the reasons presented in the November 17, 2009 Amendment, which is incorporated herein in its entirety. Furthermore, the rejection grounds contain the following errors:

1. With respect to Courtot, the Examiner points out that the bolt 14 and the housing 10 are axially fixed together. Applicant agrees. However, claim 43 recites that the shaft and the first member are "fixed" together. The term "fixed" excludes any movement between the parts, while "axially fixed" does not exclude a relative rotation ... like the relative rotation that occurs between the bolt 14 and the housing 10 of Courtot.

2. The Examiner concludes that Courtot's metal tubing 8 is provided at a spaced location around the circumference of the shaft. This is simply not understood. How is the location of the tubing 8 spaced? It certainly is not spaced from another tubing because only the single tubing 8 is present in the reference. Clarification is respectfully requested.

3. Contrary to the Examiner assertions, the secondary reference to Ziegler does not relate to a "swivel." As is well known in this art, a "swivel" is a connection having mutually rotatable members. In contrast, Ziegler's umbilical cord 20 does not have any parts that rotate relative to each other.

4. At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner makes several allegations, and characterizes the allegations as knowledge commonly available in the art. The allegations, however, are refutable. For example, multiple media members would not necessarily allow for transfer of a larger amount of media than a single member. This is because an increased number of media members could create more drag against the flow of the media, which could result in transfer of a lesser amount of media. In any event, the Examiner has not pointed out why an increased flow of media would have been desirable in the first place.

5. The Examiner characterizes the claimed invention as a mere duplication of parts of a prior art device. This is simply not the case. As pointed out in the previous Amendment, even if Courtot were modified to include a plurality of tubes 8, the tubes 8 would *not* be "provided at spaced apart locations around the circumference of the shaft," as claimed. This is because each of the tubes 8 would extend completely around the bolt 14, as expressly taught by Courtot.¹

Notwithstanding, in view of the May 13, 2010 interview, Applicant amends independent claim 43 by incorporating the features identified by the Examiner that would more clearly overcome the rejections of records. Applicant respectfully submits that Courtot and Ziegler (taken alone or in combination) do not teach or suggest the "bearing" or "base plate" features defined by independent claim 43.

¹ See, Courtot, col. 2, lines 29-35.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant earnestly solicits allowance of all of the pending claims.

Pursuant to 37 CFR §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant petitions for a three (3) month extension of time for filing a reply to the Office Action and concurrently submit the required extension fee.

The Commissioner is authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4446 for any additional fees required under 37 CFR § 1.16 or under 37 CFR § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Herman R. Heflin III/
Herman R. Heflin III, Reg. No. 41,060
P.O. Box 1210
Vienna, VA 22183
(888) 703-1110